

points. I think that those that are involved in this bill, and I am not, for which I offer my unlimited thanks. But the issue that I cannot quite grasp is that except for the repeating of the same issue five or six times, I've heard no substantive arguments in regard to the bill. That bothers me a little bit. It appears what we did--we had a tape recorder and we played the same tape recorder an hour a day for 14 days. As tolerant as I am, I'm awfully tired of that. So if the proponents of the bill have failed to place the necessary items in this Code, then those that are opponents should come forward with some kind of objections that we can understand as to what the problem is. The issues that have been debated so far, as I said before, are reruns. I, for one until somebody starts talking about substantive issues, will move to put the bill across.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: Chair recognizes Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Members of the Legislature. Senator Lewis is either asleep, or he doesn't listen, or he can't understand what he hears. Now one of the most silly bills I've heard discussed year after year is the aid to education, and he leads in that. If you want to talk about reruns, that is where it is. Now if he thinks that matters that can hang children up are nonsubstantive issues, then either he hasn't listened, or he doesn't understand what he has heard. As for the way the bill is being handled, I don't think he understands anything at all about this particular bill, and that means he ought to just sit there and smoke his cigar which he is an expert at doing. He can smoke up the air, but he's not going to smoke up this issue. I don't care how tired he or anybody else gets, I'm going to discuss these bills on Select File, and I may discuss them until he gets disgusted enough to leave and take a little hiatus and rest awhile until I get through discussing the issues that are of concern to me as he discussed an issue like naming a sports coliseum which was of concern to him. But when we see the issue specifically that he sees as having substance, we can understand why he would feel that crimes against the person are nonsubstantive. Crimes against property are nonsubstantive. Establishing an entire new structure of sentencing is nonsubstantive. Now to get to the bill, again on LB 41, I tell you that when you establish certain penalties for certain offenses in LB 38 prior to considering 39, 40 and 41, you may be in a position of having voted one way, and you would not have voted that way had you had all of the information. Perhaps in view of the number of things that are called Class V misdemeanors, or whichever, perhaps there should be minimums established. But without seeing everything that is going to be drawn into, under and covered by the cloak of a Class V misdemeanor, perhaps it doesn't seem that a minimum is necessary. I do believe that substantive decisions have been made by the actions taken in 39, 40 and 41. I am not going to vote to hurry these bills along. I know that I have bills pending, but that is what makes me who I am and what I am. I don't care what kind of retaliatory action is taken against me in the form of attacking bills. The bills that have my name on them are not me. There was a message I had to give to another session of the Legislature, and that was that in their superstitious simplicity they were adhering to a notion of voodoo that by associating the bill with me and killing the bill they are somehow harming me. But that does not compute, and that is not correct. You can intimidate others